

|  |                                      |                                       |  |
|--|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| <b><i>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</i></b> | <b>Application No.</b><br>10/591,541 | <b>Applicant(s)</b><br>JOBBAGY ET AL. |  |
|  | <b>Examiner</b><br>BRYAN WRIGHT      | <b>Art Unit</b><br>2431               |  |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) BRYAN WRIGHT. (3) Joseph Seeber, reg. no. 27,719.

(2) \_\_\_\_\_. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 26 January 2012.

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (copy given to: ☐ applicant ☒ applicant's representative)

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Issues Discussed ☐ 101 ☐ 112 ☐ 102 ☐ 103 ☒ Others  
(For each of the checked box(es) above, please describe below the issue and detailed description of the discussion)

Claim(s) discussed: 5.

Identification of prior art discussed: N/A.

**Substance of Interview**  
(For each issue discussed, provide a detailed description and indicate if agreement was reached. Some topics may include: identification or clarification of a reference or a portion thereof, claim interpretation, proposed amendments, arguments of any applied references etc...)

The Examiner contacted attorney of record, Joseph Seeber with a proposed amendment to claims 5-13 to place the application in condition for allowance. The Examiner notes that Mr. Seeber agreed to the proposed claims and agreed to capture the claim amendment in an Examiner's Amendment.

**Applicant recodation instructions:** It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of interview.

**Examiner recodation instructions:** Examiners must summarize the substance of any interview of record. A complete and proper recodation of the substance of an interview should include the items listed in MPEP 713.04 for complete and proper recodation including the identification of the general thrust of each argument or issue discussed, a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed regarding patentability and the general results or outcome of the interview, to include an indication as to whether or not agreement was reached on the issues raised.

☐ Attachment

|   |  |
|---|--|
| /BRYAN WRIGHT/<br>Examiner, Art Unit 2431 | /NATHAN FLYNN/<br>Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2431 |
|---|--|